

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Drori et al. (U.S. Patent 6,555,996).

Claim 1 recites "a bulk impedance device having ... an impedance value greater than an impedance of the string of elemental impedance devices". (Emphasis added.)

The Examiner indicates that the resistor stack 60 of Drori et al. corresponds with "the string of elemental impedance devices" as recited by Claim 1. The Examiner further indicates that the variable resistance networks 20 and 40 of Drori et al. correspond with "a bulk impedance device" as recited by Claim 1.

Drori et al. teach that each of resistors 62_k [in the resistor stack 60] has a value substantially equal to a value of R_s ohms". (Drori et al., Col. 4, lines 30-32.) In addition, Drori et al. teach that each of the variable resistance networks 20 and 40 "varies between zero ohms and a value of R_p ohms". (Drori et al., Col. 4, lines 7-15.) Drori et al. also teach that "each of variable resistance networks 20 and 40 has a plurality of resistance values which are spaced substantially equally from one another by an increment ΔR_p ", wherein ΔR_p is necessarily smaller than R_p . (Drori et al., Col. 4, lines 58-62.) Finally, Drori et al. teach that "the value of R_p is substantially equal to the quantity $(R_s - \Delta R_p)$ ". (Drori et al., Col. 4, lines 65-66.)

Consequently, Drori et al. explicitly teaches that the resistance value of R_p is less than the resistance value of R_s (by value ΔR_p). Because Drori et al. teaches that the resistance value R_p of variable resistance networks 20 and 40 is less than the resistance value R_s of a single resistor in resistor stack 60, Drori et al. necessarily fail to teach "a bulk impedance device having ... an impedance value greater

than an impedance of the string of elemental impedance devices" as recited by Claim 1.

For this reason, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Drori et al.

Claims 2-6 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, the Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Because Applicants believe that base Claim 1 is allowable for reasons provided above, Applicants are not amending Claims 2-6 at this time.

Claims 1 and 7-10 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 37 and 40-43 of co-pending Application No. 10/660,222. Applicants are including a terminal disclaimer in the same package as the present response, thereby overcoming this double patenting rejection.

Applicants note the allowance of Claims 11-36.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-36 are pending in the present application.
Claims 2-10 are allowable and Claims 11-36 are allowed.
Reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 is requested. If
there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at
(925) 895-3545 to expedite prosecution of this case.


Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 22888

E. Eric Hoffman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,186

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

8-10-05 
Date Signature: E. Eric Hoffman